DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 770 EA 017 240

AUTHOR LoGerfo, James W.
TITLE The Training of Teachers: A Dubious Record.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 37p.; In: Marshner, Connaught, Ed. A Blueprint for Education Reform. p75-110. For the complete document, see EA 017 236.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Course Evaluation; Cultural Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Education Courses; *Public Education; Relevance (Education); Schools of Education; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; Teacher Certification; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The training of teachers may be the most important component in any attempt at successful and productive educational reform. The core of the crisis will remain until there are thoughtful, substantive reforms in this area. A teaching license or certificate is required in order to teach in a public school. In order to highlight the problem of teacher training, interviews were conducted with a group of students who enrolled in a New Jersey state college's education courses. Deficiencies in the present system were revealed and solutions pointed out. The typical minimum program of five courses was found to be uniformly unsatisfactory. There was little correlation between course content and actual classroom experience or the catalog description; and the teachers advocated outdated theories, were ill-prepared, made minimal demands of students, discussed unrelated topics in class, and used only a portion of the allotted class time. Such problems are due to the creation of course requirements and courses as a concession to pressure groups or legislators, and to lack of a broad cultural education for teachers of education courses. Among the solutions discussed are opening the profession to broadly educated liberal arts graduates without compelling them to endure a series of frustrating education courses and establishing the following as principle requirements for education students: subject area competence, a suitable personality, and a sense of mission. (DCS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FOUR

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Connaught Marshner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED250770

The Training of Teachers: A Dubious Record

James W. LoGerfo

Although educational reform is currently very much on the public mind, not enough attention has been paid to what may be the most important component in any attempt at successful and productive reform: the training of teachers.

No matter how many recommendations are implemented, no matter how much money is dedicated to educational reform, the core of the crisis will remain until there are thoughtful, substantive reforms in this area. This problem is not new, nor has it gone unnoticed. Gilbert Highet, the noted Columbia classicist and author of *The Art of Teaching*, is supposed to have remarked more than thirty years ago that West 120th Street in Manhattan was the widest street in the world: it separated the main part of Columbia's campus, with its traditional science and humanities departments, from Teachers College.

Highet's observation was made before the intense changes in educational finance, organization, and student attitudes that took place in the sixties and seventies which brought about a significant change in the nature of the very people who entered the teaching profession. During this period there were massive infusions of federal money into

EA 017 240

state educational systems, which led to, *inter alia*, a general reduction in the student-teacher ratio and a consequent, almost desperate need for many more teachers.

Initially, the problem was not acute. The lure of membership in a fairly respectable but low paid profession, and in the case of male students, a means to postpone or avoid conscription, helped to fill most of the newly created teacher vacancies. The commitment and qualifications of many of these teachers was naturally questionable. To compound the problem, the waning of the idealism of the sixties created a climate where students once again found the pursuit of money acceptable. Men and women who once considered entering social work, teaching, the Peace Corps, or spending several years travelling around the country to "find themselves" were now filling business management and pre-law programs. A small group of students continued, and still continue, to enroll in traditional liberal arts courses in pursuit of broad culture and learning. Still later, computer science departments, offering students genuine assurances of lucrative careers after graduation, absorbed most of the more intelligent and ambitious students and, as a result, administered the *coup de grace* to any remaining hope for attracting students of high caliber to established education departments.

It is therefore not surprising that the pool of students planning to enter teaching is today deplorably small, and many lack the intellectual equipment to engender continuing faith in the teaching profession. In New Jersey, the state on which this study will focus, 57% of students entering undergraduate education programs scored below 400 on the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Only 43% of students enrolling in all other programs scored below 400 on the SAT. The scores of future teachers on the math portion of the test are no less revealing: 47% of them scored below 400, while only 35% of students with other intentions did so. Only one percent of the education majors scored above 600 on the verbal portion, against seven percent of students contemplating other fields.[1]

This unwelcome phenomenon, interestingly enough is not confined to undergraduate students of education. At the end of a three year, nation-wide scrutiny of Graduate Record Examination scores, the Educational Testing Service, the administrators of the GRE found that the average verbal scores of students wishing to do graduate work in education were lower than those in all but four of the 92 fields covered by the test. Graduate education students, for example, achieved an average score of 440 on the verbal portion; the average of students entering graduate English programs was 587.[2]

Not all students entering undergraduate education programs, however, graduate in the bottom quarter of their high school class. And this, ultimately, is a source of hope. Despite low salaries, low status (a recent phenomenon), excessive paperwork, and the relatively new—and proper—movement toward accountability, there are still people who want to teach, and who possess the intellectual ability, commitment, creativity, and personality needed for success. There is a high degree of satisfaction derived from bringing children from point A to point B on a scale of intellectual achievement, in seeing children grow in skills, self-confidence, and critical thinking ability.

It is not uncommon, in fact, for people with established, but perhaps unsatisfactory, careers to want to begin anew as teachers. This trend seems to be increasing and could well provide a quick, partial amelioration of the real crisis in education.

For those aspirant teachers, whether recent college graduates or older adults changing careers, a teaching position can still be found today without too much difficulty, albeit with below average salaries, at a private or parochial school. If these schools did not have palpably finite sources of funding, they might be considered malicious exploiters of idealistic men and women. Although most private schools are unable to pay salaries commensurate with those in the public sector, there are some prosperous, well-endowed, and well-known schools (including not a few with overt

religious affiliation) which, thanks to upper class student bodies, can match the public school salary schedules. Most cannot.

Intellectual idealism aside, teachers are willing to accept sub-standard compensation—and sometimes extra responsibilities in private schools because of the prospect of working with more intelligent, highly motivated students, a smaller bureaucratic maze, and, above all, no obligation to possess the usual credentials, a license or certificate granted by the state education department. This document provides the entree to the public school system and it presupposes completion of a possibly lengthy sequence of education courses. A teacher in a private school need never have taken so much as a single education course; the overwhelming majority of private school teachers have subject area majors within the context of a broad liberal arts course of study. Many observers, including not a few parents, consider the predominantly liberal arts education of these teachers an asset and a significant factor contributing to the high reputation private schools enjoy.

This problem is particularly acute for the older aspirant teachers. Adults intent on exchanging an established career for one in teaching will, after weighing all considerations, invariably opt to teach in a public school, principally to avoid an unwelcome diminution of income. But to do so requires a teaching license or certificate.

As a means of highlighting a fundamental cause of the current crisis in education, it might be beneficial to examine the program of studies required to obtain a teaching certificate. The New Jersey system will be used here as a typical example. The state has a high level of prosperity, some of its counties have the highest per capita incomes in the nation, its school districts spend generously on education—and the state expenditure per pupil, at $4,190, is the third highest in the nation.[3] The state is also close to the cultural mecca of New York City. Its population is highly educated and its taxpayers, regardless of income, are concerned with the quality of education; this is especially true in the wealthier suburbs, where well-paid professionals are

willing to pay a premium for high quality public education. As a result, the average class size in the state is 16; the national average is 18. New Jersey has a relatively small and accessible education bureaucracy and its regulations pertaining to certification are not too ponderous. Education programs are available at most of its private colleges and at six of its eight public colleges.

New Jersey currently requires its teachers to have studied a basic minimum of five three-credit courses: Educational Psychology, two courses in the teaching of reading, one course from a broad category called Human and Intercultural Relations, and an elective such as Introduction to Education.

The only people who can benefit from this minimum are those who have a bachelor's degree and have already acquired some teaching experience in a non-public school, or those who enter little known programs at the state's two largest universities. An undergraduate student, however, who enters college with the intention of acquiring the certificate through an education major must take a minimum of 55 credits in education courses. (The number could increase to 71 required credits, depending on the specialization). These forty credits beyond the minimum mandated by the state are a requirement of the college's education division. College graduates returning to college only for the certificate, and who have had no teaching experience whatever, are also constrained to take 43 credits in education, no matter how intense their concentration in a subject field, no matter how sound the reputation of their college.

The reason candidate teachers find themselves compelled to more than double their exposure to education courses is the requirement for them to serve as a student teacher. The state merely requires the experience; in practice, arrangements to serve as a student teacher in a public school can only be made through a college with a recognized education program. It is this monopoly that endows the college with the privilege to design an education program as it wishes. This is, in essence, the tie that binds

aspirant teachers, whether degree holders or not, to college education departments. It is very difficult to circumvent this monopoly; it can be minimized: only Rutgers, the more selective state university, and Fairleigh Dickinson University will sponsor a student teacher who has completed only the state's minimum 15 credit requirement, but this mitigation applies to candidates who already hold degrees.

A candidate who not only has a degree but also at least three years of full-time teaching experience, at a private or parochial school or at the college level, is exempt from the student teaching requirement, provided he works directly through the state education department. Thus, the eight weeks of student teaching are decreed by the state to equal three years of teaching without the benefit of a faculty mentor to pilot the novice through the shoals of one's first teaching experience. It is true that a faculty mentor can be useful, by helping the new teacher to prepare the all important lesson plans, to fill out the plethora of forms required at all levels of the education establishment, and, more importantly, how to adjust technique to individual classes or individual students or to resolve discrete personality problems. Whether or not this can be done adequately within eight weeks is another question.

All of these requirements are enforced inflexibly: despite the acknowledged shortage of science teachers, for example, the state education department's certification division recently refused to grant a certificate to a Scotswoman who had completed three of the five required education courses, had extensive teaching experience, and had completed over 100 credit hours in her science specialization. The woman obviously had both a desire to teach and the requisite academic credentials, but, not being able to satisfy adamantine requirements, she was forced to abandon the profession she practiced so well in the United Kingdom.

Although student teaching is required for those without previous teaching experience, the length of one's assignment as a student teacher is not uniform. It is not uncommon to hear of a student teaching assignment lasting only five weeks. Thus the length of what is probably the most

beneficial component of the teacher training program is dependent on the whims of the faculty mentor or the sponsoring classroom teacher.

One undeniable benefit of the student teaching system is the potential for detecting a candidate who is ill-suited to classroom teaching. An education major may have done well in his or her course work, and may even have prepared superlative lesson plans, but may have retained little from the former and may implement the latter incoherently; he may be irascible, overly sensitive, or generally unable to conduct a class successfully. This potential for weeding out the truly unqualified is rarely exercised. The shortage of teachers in many subject areas, the laxness of many mentors, the hope that the inept candidate will bloom late, if given one or two more years of actual classroom experience, and the reluctance to halt a career in which so much has already been invested, all conspire to obviate what should be a very natural process.

The Program

Once having decided to become a teacher, what is the program the prospective teacher must face? Actual recent experiences will be used to weigh the value of the typical minimum program. The actual college will go unnamed, but, because there is very little variation in the nature of the programs and the credentials of the faculty teaching the courses, it could very well serve as a composite of all six state colleges which offer education programs. (It is also not atypical in its offering of graduate credit for summer programs devoted to the study of the geology of Hawaii or to "an extensive camping and canoeing experience in northern Ontario").

As in many state colleges, the number of adults enrolled as matriculated students is astonishingly high. These students must first endure the bureaucratic rigors of waiting for signatures and attending boring and often patronizing counseling sessions with faculty advisors. Since many of the advisees are people who have given up existing careers in order to become teachers, their level of commitment is

high and they have mature personality traits. It is unfortunate that this is their first encounter with the educational establishment. That they can overcome these obstacles is a testimony to the strength of their commitment.

A common complaint among novice teachers is that there was little correlation between the content of their courses and the classroom situations they encountered during their first years of teaching. This is not a case of the traditional disparity between theory and application; it concerns, rather, the actual subject matter that is taught. Why weren't the courses useful? Should they not be intended to proffer practical advice? Have the courses and overall curricula for teachers changed over the years? Do they reflect the legitimate concerns of scholarly observers of education? If the curricula do not change much from year to year, does actual course content change? Is there a connection between the description of a course in the college's catalogue and the actual presentation of the course? These and other questions can be answered by a careful examination of a typical and traditional teacher training program.

In any such discussion, it is useful to remember that every student, regardless of the institution or program, is likely to encounter one or two poor instructors in the course of a college career. But when the number of unsatisfactory courses nearly equals the number of courses studied, there is an intrinsic problem not only with the instructors, but with the program as well. This was the experience of a group of students who enrolled in education courses at this college during the academic year 1982-83.

All of the students interviewed had at least one degree before entering the education program and were comparing the instructors in the program with college professors in traditional liberal arts disciplines

Each undergraduate education student at this college is required to register for between 55 and 71 credit hours, depending on the specialization; this is in addition to 36 credits in general education (liberal arts), to be chosen from subject area groups, that is, social sciences, arts, natural sciences, humanities.

The courses that will be examined constitute the minimum prescribed by the state: Educational Psychology, two courses in the teaching of reading, a course in Human and Intercultural Relations, and an elective.

Educational Psychology

The not very felicitously phrased catalogue description for educational psychology notes that the student will be exposed to an "analysis of learning theory and its application. Considers cognition, motivation, tests and measurements." This is the only course of the required five that could be considered preparation for actual classroom experience.

In several sections of this course, offered in both day and evening sessions, each with different instructors during the academic year 1982-83, there was in fact a serious disparity between the catalogue description and the actual conduct of the class. Each instructor appeared to be somewhat eccentric. Educational psychology is a fully independent department at this college (as it is at most colleges with education programs), and not in any way connected to the Psychology Department; its instructors are required, whether full time members of the college faculty or adjunct instructors, to possess at least a Master's degree in the field. But this is no guarantee that the catalogue description will be implemented. One student told of a professor who assigned no textbook (something not inherently ill-advised) or any other reading material for the course, because, he said, no text would include all the most current data or the variety of topics he wanted to cover.

From the beginning, however, his lectures depended on research and analyses that were published and discussed as far back as 15-20 years ago: principally those of the Romantic Critics. They provided the philosophical underpinning for his lectures. They were his reference, his touchstone, his source for authority and legitimacy. This is not the place to discuss the merits of the group's critique of education, but a summary would be in order, especially since this man was not the only one at the college propounding their

views. The group includes Paul Goodman, whose book, *Compulsory Mis-Education*, is the centerpiece of the genre; *Coming of Age in America* by Edgar Friedenberg, *How Children Fail* by John Holt, *The Greening of America* by Charles Reich are other books in this group.[4] The gravamen of their complaint was that schools create an atmosphere suffused by control, distrust, and the constant threat of punishment. Children are bored because of poor teaching techniques, they are confused because they are not taught how to think, they are afraid because they think they will not get from education what they think they should get. Schools, in short, are more concerned with indoctrination than with thinking.

The experimental systems that these authors suggested as alternatives to the authoritarian, traditional schools, have either failed or been marginally successful. Their lack of success may have derived from excessive idealism and not enough practical appreciation of human nature. The impracticality of the experiments did not *eo ipso* provide a defense for the genuine weaknesses of the traditional schools, but attempting to prepare future teachers for the classroom with only this idealism as a buttress is an exercise in folly.

With the Romantics as his intellectual armour, this particular instructor proceeded to maintain repeatedly that the main goal of education is to improve the self-image of the student, and that teachers should not set unattainable goals. Not a few parents might think that education has as its purpose the imparting of skills, the development of critical thinking processes, and the acquisition of the substance of one's cultural heritage. Not so, according to this educational psychologist. Whatever skills are acquired should be through the Mastery Learning theory of Benjamin Bloom, which contends that all children are capable of learning, but they should not be graded on how much they have learned; they should be judged instead by how long they take to learn. A full class is exposed to new material; the brighter students will master it quickly and then stop to help their weaker mates learn the material. The class does

not progress until all students have learned the material. By the end of the year, not very much learning will have taken place. The system does give the student the feeling that something, however little, has been learned; and the teacher who, as part of a group that was criticized by the Romantics for having very low expectations for students, can now derive satisfaction from knowing that even the poorest student has learned something.[5]

In addition, a good teacher will try to understand why children misbehave rather than demonstrate how to behave. This can be achieved by taking a real interest in the students by knowing their birthdays, personal problems, hobbies and interests, and by using the students' own form of communication, instead of setting a higher cultural norm to which all students should strive. Every student should leave each lesson with some degree of self-esteem, even if some insignificant fact is all he can remember.

There is a related concept, called the "Pygmalion Effect," after the mythical Greek sculptor Pygmalion who created a perfect statue, Galatea, which came to life. To educational psychologists, this means that if a teacher will treat all students as candidates for learning, they will learn. Advocates of this theory like to allude to Shaw's version of the Pygmalion story by pointing to Eliza Doolittle's claim that the difference between a lady and a flower girl is the way she is treated. Therefore if each student is treated as if he were Einstein, he could master the intricacies of physics with great facility. Even to learn simple arithmetic, however, a flower girl will have to have a flexible mind, industry, interest, patience, and some degree of ambition, as well as that attribute denied in fashionable education circles: native intelligence.

Ironically, most of this instructor's lectures were delivered in dogmatic fashion: each of his tenets was repeated over and over again and no deviation from a prepared formulation was permitted. He certainly had not learned from the Romantic Critics even though their thought formed the substance of his beliefs. His two tests in the course each consisted of ten short answer questions. On the

session before each test, he rehearsed the questions and their answers with the class so test answers would perfectly mirror his formulations. Only chronic absenteeism would result in a grade lower than C. As it happened, during the first test, several students had not in fact done any preparation and were openly, nay, defiantly cheating. Two students who had observed this behavior planned to bring it to the instructor's attention at the end of the next session. They did not have the opportunity.

The next session was devoted to the problem of student tensions. In the present competitive nature of schooling at all levels, the instructor observed, students could not avoid tension. Cheating, he maintained, was one excellent way to relieve tension. Knowing that one can cheat and not be punished for it will make students less anxious and more willing to keep coming to school and tolerating the otherwise intolerable authoritarian nature of education. Similarly, he discouraged teachers from assigning homework before a week-end and certainly never before a holiday.

This desire to have a child avoid failure may be an unimpeachably idealistic goal, but it is certainly not helpful as preparation for life in the adult world at the end of formal schooling. A child should experience occasional failure, partly as an exercise in maturation, partly as an incentive for further achievement.

This same instructor did not return his mid-term examination until two weeks before the end of the term (a traditional complaint of students through the ages), which contradicted his many admonitions to his students to remember the need of their own pupils for frequent assessments of the quality of their work in class. His one written assignment, a three page critique of virtually any book touching on education, would not, alas, be graded, but only contain a check mark, indicating they were submitted. The check mark was in his grade book; the actual papers were never returned to the students, denying students an appraisal of their critical evaluation skills. This probably didn't make a difference in any case, because he encouraged students merely to read in order to obtain the princi-

pal message of the book. If this could be done by reading the first and last chapters, that was acceptable to him. He wanted students merely to hold a book on education in their hands, however briefly. If future teachers did not have to be subjected to a rigorous analytical exercise in one of the key courses in their program, would they be likely to ask their own students, in the fullness of time, to do so?

Education and Social Change

Propagating the tenets of the Romantic Critics was not confined to Educational Psychology. A course within the category of Human and Intercultural Relations, called Education and Social Change, was taught by another of its champions. This is a course whose very title implied a vital connection between education and change in society, and should have been filled with the potential for discussing and defending theoretical positions on the social role of education. The instructor seemed an apt selection for teaching the course: he was a high ranking college administrator who would naturally be familiar with the latest developments in the social standing of education as perceived and interpreted by political interests and the machinations of politicians at all levels of government. He would presumably be aware of current proposals for reform or innovative teaching concepts. Instead, the hoary theses of the Romantic Critics were again adduced, buttressed by an occasional two sentence summary of historical attitudes toward education. When an instructor has too many other, non-teaching burdens, it is difficult to keep current in his field, and there is a natural tendency to rely on antiquated college notes or the memory of graduate school lectures as source materials.

Another leitmotiv, expressed repeatedly in a two sentence format, was a disquisition on the power and influence of the press (the education editor of the only state-wide newspaper in particular) on education. This rather diaphanous lecture material was supplemented by films produced twenty years ago that were intended to elucidate educational techniques and problems current at the time the films were made. These film selections should not have

been too surprising, coming from a partisan of the somewhat archaic, if not wholly discredited, Romantic Critics. The course was, in short, neither a history of education nor an examination of contemporary problems, reforms, or goals. Students were treated to a light melange of nostrums, current events, and common sense.

There was never an attempt to instill any degree of professionalism into the course. This would have been difficult in any case, since the instructor, as a high level administrator in the college, was frequently absent from class because he was attending or conducting meetings on campus or attending meetings or testifying before committees of the state legislature. Students became as familiar with the department chairman, who announced absences or anticipated tardiness, as with the absent or tardy instructor. Of the fifteen weekly sessions, he was absent from seven, late for all the others. Most of the sessions that he conducted lasted little more than an hour (of the scheduled two hours and thirty minutes). When his time in class was not devoted to his recurring leitmotivs, he supervised the viewing of video tapes of his interviews with people concerned with education, principally other members of the college faculty (although, to his credit, he did have two twenty minute interviews with the *Star-Ledger* Education Editor).

The principal student requirement in this class was a paper on a topical issue in education, such as sex education, student suicides, the shortage of athletic coaches and math teachers, or similar topics. Each student also had to present an oral summary of his research before his classmates at the end of the term. Each presentation was originally scheduled to last fifteen to twenty minutes during the last two or three sessions of the term. Because of the instructor's many absences, only two sessions remained in which the presentations could be fit, which meant they had perforce to last ten minutes each.

During the second half of the first of these sessions, however, the instructor, emitting an air of masterly insouciance, permitted the importunate president of the college's

faculty union to present his membership's argument for an increase in the state sales tax, which would permit more state money to be spent on faculty salaries. The union leader followed his unscheduled presentation with a request to the students to write form letters to their state legislators urging the increase. As it happened, he came with a generous supply of form letters, envelopes, postage stamps, and lists of the names and addresses of the legislators. He even offered to determine which legislator served which students in the event students did not already know the appropriate names. Without hearing any opposing views, students were under moral pressure to write the letters in the prescribed manner and submit them, properly addressed, into a box carried by the union president as he went from student to student.

In the end, students could derive dubious satisfaction from having participated in partisan political activity that had as its issue a one percent increase in the state sales tax.

This loss of time (and possible violation of student consciences), absorbed the entire remainder of that session, which left only one session into which all the remaining oral presentations had to be squeezed. And squeezed they were. Students were compelled to rumble through a 3-5 minute oral precis of a 10 page paper in a nervous, almost incoherent manner. The educational benefits to students listening to their peers' research was difficult to discern.

To accommodate all the students, this last session lasted well beyond the allotted 2½ hours; and the instructor, in the final minutes of the term, admitted ruefully that he had not achieved all that he had wanted to achieve during the semester. Amen!

Reading

New Jersey has a requirement that all applicants for a teaching certificate must first successfully complete two courses in how to help students improve their reading skills (an attempted solution addressed in the mid-seventies to the newly perceived problem of student illiteracy). One of the courses is Foundations in Content Reading: Secondary

(Elementary) and the other on Teaching Reading in the Secondary (Elementary) School. This two course sequence provoked the most animated comments from students who either were enrolled in the courses or who had completed them. Most admitted the potential for good was inherent in the sequence, but they also agreed that the material could easily have been condensed into a one semester course without measurable harm. The selection of texts for the two courses assuredly supports this conclusion: the text for the first course was entitled *Reading Strategies for Middle and Secondary School Teachers*, and *Reading Instruction in the Secondary School* was the other. Indeed, one teacher in the department admitted that the reading requirement was initially advocated as a means to provide work for reading specialists, which would also have the salutary coincidental effect of enhancing every teacher's ability to raise the reading level of his or her pupils.

Only one of the several reading instructors on the undergraduate level (the college also has graduate level professors in a program offering advanced degrees in reading) evaluated by students in this survey was able to conduct a reasonably successful course, and also came close to measuring up to standards that would approximate the competence one would expect from an instructor in a liberal arts subject. This person who taught Foundations in Content Reading, had a well-organized syllabus, which was adhered to throughout the semester, and was able to maintain control over the class.

Because of the technical nature of the subject, borrowing from physiology, psychology, biology, and other areas, there was scant room for fatuous comments from the teacher or ill-formed opinions from the students. The two exams were composed exclusively of 100 multiple choice questions which may or may not have been educationally justifiable. Indeed, the instructor was so conscientious that the material presented was sometimes overwhelmingly oppressive and some of the discerning students thought there was a lack of discrimination in the preparation of the lectures; the material seemed to have been gathered, al-

most promiscuously, from the instructor's own graduate student career.

There was an attempt to offset this by approaching each topic from several different avenues, something that most of the other instructors were unable to do, regardless of subject. Although a grading scale was used, high grades were not easily or automatically attained. Unlike most of the other instructors in the education program, this one refrained from waxing autobiographical during each session as a substitute for unprepared lecture material. Many tend to consume the bulk of a session with detailed descriptions of youthful adventures, divorce proceedings, surgical operations, stress (this derives mainly from the fear that their jobs will be abolished), hobbies, and other interests.

In general, each session in this instructor's course lasted about one and one half hours, out of a possible two and one half hours. Although standing out from all others in the department, the instructor had other shortcomings which will be discussed later.

Another teacher of this subject was unable to prepare his lectures conscientiously; nor did he seem to want to hold his students for more than half of each scheduled session. He was indifferent and desultory in his lecture style. He did, however, have a decent general education and thus his ramblings were not entirely lost on at least a few of his better educated students. A good portion of class time was devoted to promoting his own consulting firm, which specialized in—not reading, oddly enough, but stress control—something he apparently did not require himself as a result of his academic labors. It would be difficult, in short, to claim that the foundations of reading techniques were taught in his class.

Yet another instructor in this department, giving a course on the Teaching of Reading in the Secondary Schools was an unmitigated disaster for students, the department, and the institution itself. Students in her classes would perforce form such unfavorable, indeed hostile views of the college that unavoidably their views would be broadcast widely.

This instructor routinely came into class 20-30 minutes late and during class would make frequent trips back to her office to fetch some forgotten but inevitably useless materials. She always arrived with a large cup of coffee in one hand and a cigarette in the other (and smoked several more during the session) despite the presence of three printed signs expressly forbidding both drinking and smoking.

There was very little lecturing or useful discussion. Two full sessions, for example, were devoted to a clumsy demonstration of an intelligence test used to determine capability for auditory discrimination. She did not explain the significance of the test, nor did she attempt to put it in a context. She did maintain, however, that most teachers in the public schools will typically *not* have occasion to use it. Students inevitably left each session with a feeling of benumbed helplessness. Other sessions were ill-prepared, devoted to rambling digressions or discussions having very little to do with her syllabus. This was justified because, she claimed, the assigned text was so thorough there was scant more she could add to enhance it during class. Two short meetings were devoted to discussions of the contemporary state of education, with her reflections on the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education as the centerpiece. She merely disagreed with its conclusions (in an attitude of unrelenting hostility), but acknowledged, then and frequently throughout the course, the poor state of literacy among high school and college seniors. She herself contributed nothing to the amelioration of that problem. At the end of the semester, her students were no more able to increase the reading abilities of their future pupils than when they first entered her classroom.

After a demonstration of another intelligence test, comprising 100 multiple choice vocabulary questions, and given to class members so they could determine for themselves the level of difficulty of currently tested vocabulary words, she went over the answers using a poorly hidden dictionary, indicating her own lack of mastery of 100 not too esoteric words; she even mispronounced many of them.

Given the nature of a course treating of literacy, even feigning mastery of the material would have been an intellectual imperative. A teacher uncertain of vocabulary might have discreetly marked a copy of an answer sheet in order to avoid undermining her credibility. There were enough similar instances that by the end of the term her authority was in shreds and her credibility irretrievably lost.

When her mid-term examination, consisting of 100 objective questions, was returned, some of the more alert students in the class realized that between 9 and 13 questions that had been marked wrong were actually correct. One true-false question had stated that "the word 'base' had only one meaning." Only students who had marked that statement as true received credit. With this obvious incentive, more students quickly began noticing other mismarked answers. The instructor would not countenance appeals to discuss the disputed answers and, regrettably, made no effort to re-grade the examination.

Unwilling to discern the unprofessionalism of her behavior, she remained obdurate. Her justification, she explained, was based on the excessive amount of time she had already devoted to grading the examination. She couldn't possibly do more. When students themselves became adamant, because of the obvious justice of their case, she only expanded on her rationalization and explained her grading process. She admitted spending only one half-hour grading the exam by use of a key. Four more hours, however, were spent analyzing the results. She had determined how many students chose the wrong answer for each question, and, in the case of the multiple choice questions, how many students picked each of the five possible choices. This effort was made, she allowed, so she would know whether or not the questions were apt for that particular course in the future.

Most teachers would know when they were preparing an examination if they had in fact covered in class the material to be included on the test and they would by mid-term have an approximate appreciation of the intellectual capabilities

of most class members. After carefully explaining this process, called "item analysis," the instructor admitted that she would in any case use the same test the next semester, an admission only partly induced by anger provoked by the challenges to the validity of her questions. She also apparently hoped that this explanation would appease irate students and justify her unwillingness to revise the grades on the tainted examination.

Having sensed an obvious and forceful reluctance of so many students to accept her position (including all the students who already held degrees and whom she may have considered her intellectual peers), she grudgingly offered a qualified concession: only students who provided documented proof of the grading errors would be eligible for a change of grade and only if the written evidence were submitted within one week. The grades of all the remaining students who had erroneous grades would thus not be changed.

A large portion of the class was so grateful that the grades were scaled that they were more than content with whatever grades they had received and proceeded to do nothing. This was more a testimony to the lack of incentive they had to prepare adequately before the exam than mere post-exam lassitude.

(Several of these students later criticized the "complainers" for not appreciating what the instructor did for them in scaling the grades, an indication that this instructor's classroom style was probably more typical of other education faculty than one would like to think, and that any redeeming feature, such as scaling of grades, could be considered an unadulterated boon.)

The instructor's calculated concession was successful: only five students accepted the challenge of preparing the needed documentation. For a teacher whose nine hour per week class schedule required her to be on the college campus only two nights each week, from 5:00 to 10:10 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, it is difficult to sympathize with her refusal to accept an intellectually equitable solution. She may have had other daily obligations, but they should

have been subordinated to her full-time job. Academically defensible efforts like reviewing errors in a palpably defective test should have been as important as the obligatory committee meetings, grading of papers, student conferences, etc., that may consume part of a faculty member's day. She certainly did not spend much time preparing for class meetings.

From the mid-term onward, this teacher averaged only 50 minutes in class per week and that time was devoted to discussions of current events, proposals to improve the quality of education (including the defense of the practice of granting college credit for remedial courses undertaken by ill-prepared students), and listening to her bilious comments on "the system." No more attempts were made to impart techniques for teaching reading. It was as if she had been intellectually intimidated by her students and, indeed, at least seven of the 33 students already possessed advanced degrees in traditional academic subjects and all of the other adult students already held bachelor's degrees; all were ambitious, highly motivated people, eager to enter the teaching profession despite the obstacles. Rather than say anything that might provoke challenge, it was better to say nothing. An instructor with proven expertise in a field should have no difficulty maintaining control over a class for the full length of the prescribed contact hours. Either the instructor was not fully mistress of the material or the subject did not merit a full semester's treatment.

Can any administrator or partisan of the status quo defend such a course? Even if somewhere in the state the course is being taught productively, what can be said to assuage the wrath of 33 students who gained little from an entire semester?

What was most unfortunate about this particular course was that it not only fell woefully short of the goal expressed in the catalogue description, but for students obtaining their certification directly from the state, this course also satisfied the requirement for a course in "methods" (of teaching). Fortunately, this route to certification also presupposes three years' experience teaching in non-public

schools which might have provided an alternate route to gaining sufficient knowledge of how to conduct a satisfactory class.

Introduction to Education

With the need for reform in teacher preparation programs so self-evident—even before the National Commission's report—students in a college course entitled Introduction to Education were initially confronted by what appeared to be an attempt at academic overkill when they learned that the requirements for the course were exceptionally rigorous, requiring two examinations, and six separate papers. Even students accustomed to higher standards than they encountered typically at this college cavilled at the excess.

It was in truth a lot of work for a three credit undergraduate course; in the context of other education courses, it was almost bizarre. After receiving many complaints from harried students during the first few weeks of the term, the instructor relented or appeared to relent and reduced the requirements by half. Any respect one might have had for him because of his advocacy of high standards soon dissipated, however, when it was learned from students who had studied with him in previous terms that this ritual of demanding much, then succumbing to the blandishments of rebellious students was a regular, if inscrutable, practice of his.

Once the term was under way, his sessions were devoted to role playing and simulations which focused on dealing with teacher unions, parents, and racial problems. A few rather trite lectures on how to maintain pupil attention during a class, how to organize a class, engender confidence from parents rounded out the term's activities. Meanwhile, the catalogue description of the course led students to believe they were going to "consider the nature, aims, and methods of education." "Every effort made to involve participants actively, in class and out, in the theory and practice of education."

For these and other pains, this instructor, who was already a member of the college administration, was pro-

moted at the end of the semester to a higher level position. Once again, there were students who felt the combination of anecdotes, apothegms, and simulations were an apt mainstay of their professional training. At least they did not have to watch twenty year-old inspirational films.

Some Causes of the Problem

This disparity between what was proposed by the college to be taught, and what was actually taught, is an inherently insurmountable problem. A college level instructor will frequently want to depart from the sometimes rigid formulations of the catalogue, especially if he did not write the description himself, but there is usually a creatively useful side to the deviation. To deviate so chasmically and so consistently is cause to suspect not only the professionalism and conscientiousness of the instructors, but also the relevance of the courses to the teacher education program.

Although only a handful of the courses in the education program have been examined here, there is little reason to believe, based on the titles of the remaining courses and the pattern of conduct established in the courses surveyed, that the others will offer much more learning or anything else memorably helpful to future teachers.

If course requirements are not designed and implemented to promote zeal and commitment among those who will teach them, they are probably in the program only as a concession to one or another pressure group or legislator and inserted after a short-lived, albeit heated, debate when a subject was fashionably topical. The requirement for two reading courses is one such result. The instructor in this department who confessed earlier that the two courses could beneficially be merged, also revealed that a recent proposal in the faculty senate to increase the reading requirement to three courses was motivated by a desire to maintain employment among the faculty amidst declining enrollments. These are not the conditions that should precede the adoption of course requirements, especially not on a state-wide level, and not if a scintilla of academic integrity is to be preserved.

Another important reason for the distinctly poor quality of education courses and the faculty teaching them has to do with the cultural and educational levels of those who teach them. People without a broad education and a high degree of culture cannot be expected to impart those qualities to their students who in turn cannot be expected to impart them to their pupils. Most people teaching education courses began their careers teaching in public elementary schools. Later they would obtain a master's degree in education and, in some cases, a doctorate and would qualify to join state college faculties when those colleges were primarily teacher preparation colleges—not liberal arts institutions. In the sixties the movement to increase the number of available college places to accommodate an ever increasing number of high school graduates caused states either to convert education schools into liberal arts institutions or to expand the education schools to include liberal arts programs.

Erstwhile grade school teachers, newly minted as college professors, did not have the professional training needed for serious research and scholarship, even if they were teaching liberal arts subjects like English or history. These courses would perforce be taught no more rigorously than methods courses. The original faculty—who are able to earn tenure after only three years—were retained. For their part, they retained the attitudes of public school teachers, attitudes very different from the deep scholarly thoroughness one expects from liberal arts faculty. Articles in the professional journals of education average only three pages, and their subjects, like those in teacher training program classrooms, tend to be superficial. Much ado is frequently made about very little. Original research is often ignored or repudiated viscerally. There is never an item by item refutation of the newer approaches to education: merely an asseveration that the concepts prevalent when the education instructor's own education took place are still adequate. To hear, as happened at the college during the semester under study, a graduate level instructor maintain adamantly that, regardless of the flaws detected in the

current educational system by scholarly observers, he will change neither his views nor his practices, is the very epitome of unprofessionalism. Pity the students who over the years dared to challenge this professor's tenets. Pity the students who through ignorance, indolence, or docility blithely accepted those same tenets.

The values of intellectual inquiry, growth, industry, imagination, respect for sources, and tolerance that characterize liberal arts faculties are not shared by former public school teachers who through happenstance are teaching on the college level. They should in practice share those characteristics, but don't. Whatever discussion is tolerated in education courses concerns virtually meaningless topics that the professor takes as givens. Discussion is an exercise in how to discuss; it becomes an end in itself, not a means to clarify thoughts or, indeed, to formulate new thoughts.

Students in these courses unavoidably acquire many of the habits and attitudes of their professors and invariably take these with them into their own classrooms in the public schools. It is no wonder that there is boredom among contemporary high school students. A history teacher, for example, must have a thorough grasp of the subject, which can be acquired from working with serious scholars in a well designed program. While it is useful to know there are five causes of World War I, there may actually be more than five. If a teacher bases classroom discussion of this topic exclusively on an assigned text which claims there are only five causes, the teacher will not be able to evaluate them with perspective, offer imaginative interpretations, or express his points in alternate forms. On a standardized test, one should certainly know the five commonly accepted causes, but students should also know there are others to consider; they should at least know how to reason and arrive at other possible causes, and perhaps even to challenge the accepted wisdom. Someone not thoroughly trained will not be able to pursue this approach.

Since the success of education courses depends largely on the conscientiousness, education, preparation, and attitudes of the individual instructors, their own education will

have to be augmented if, for some inscrutable cause, the multiplicity of required education courses is permitted to continue. If an instructor is bored or uninterested in the subject he teaches, or merely has lost the will to teach a boring or unnecessary course, that attitude will be conveyed to his students who in turn will leave college convinced their "professional" training was so much time wasted and that they merely treaded water in order to earn their certificates.

If public school teachers are to have the broad cultural education they will need to enrich their classroom teaching, their own instructors in professional training courses should also possess that same education. Fortunately, the movement to return to requiring a broad education for all college students, exemplified by New Jersey's recent imposition of a limit on the number of education courses an education major can take, coincides with the manifold inquiries into the quality of all levels of education today, and future teachers may well find themselves in the heretofore unenviable position of having to take more courses in literature, philosophy, history, and foreign languages. It might then be possible to avoid the glaring instances of cultural deficiencies that occurred so frequently at this college and doubtless continue to occur there and elsewhere.

The educational psychologist who believed that the purpose of education should be to improve the self-image of students will surely not be in the vanguard of those advocating reform. He once cheerfully, almost proudly, confessed to his class that he routinely did poorly on standardized tests; and that when he took the Graduate Record Examination he was angered by the presence of words in the verbal section of the test not found in everyday usage. He could find no reason, for example, why anyone would ever use the word claque in conversation. He certainly never used it, and thought its inclusion on the test a gross cultural imposition. He also frequently found occasion to deprecate the study of Latin, which he had to endure as a collegian, despite a growing movement to rehabilitate Latin as a

means of improving study habits, logical thinking, and most importantly in view of SAT scores, vocabulary building.

There was also a reading teacher who, when using the word lackadaisical in her presentations before class, added on her own authority an extra s, producing lacksadaisical; she invariably added an extra syllable to mischievous, mischievious. (When she pronounced hyperbole as "hyper bowl" during a discussion of vocabulary building techniques, one student wit defined it as an athletic event that takes place in the last week of January). It was not uncommon to hear the word across pronounced by students and teachers alike as if it were spelled acrosst. If a higher culture is to be preserved, it will not be through the agency of people like these.

In her discussion of how properly to teach a lesson in social studies, another reading teacher described in abstract how an apparently composite civilization developed. She did not, however, realize it was a composite. The source she used even gave the civilization a nonsense name, Zinch Valley. A student naively queried her on whether or not it was a real place. She responded with firmness that it was indeed a real place. One of her astonished students, who possessed some research skills, looked into the matter thoroughly in the library and concluded that there was never a place named Zinch Valley. The teacher simply accepted her secondary source uncritically.

When discussing dyslexia, this same teacher reminded her auditors that Leonardo da Vinci was dyslexic, because his code writing seems to fit the writing pattern of acknowledged dyslexics. That not all of Leonardo's writing was in code, only those parts relating to secret designs for armaments—then, as now, highly classified information—had escaped her study. This teacher was also convinced that Jules Verne was a seventeenth century writer of science fiction; her own preferences in reading are the works of Stephen King and Sidney Sheldon, not exactly the admission one should make before undergraduates who should be steeping themselves in the great literature of their civilization. To admit that one's discretionary reading is

confined to popular, sensational novels, when so many acknowledged classics have not been read implies that cultural learning has ceased for this person and is thus redolent of hypocrisy.

All of these malapropisms and cultural deficiencies among professors of education take on a somber aspect when one thinks that their students have generally come from the lowest quarter of their high school classes (67 percent with an average score under 400 on the verbal portion of the SAT) and will not themselves bring much cultural knowledge to their college experience. And if, as in the case of the courses sampled at this college, exposure to jargon or faculty autobiographical anecdotes will not provide the necessary cultural enrichment or even respect for it, how will they be obtained? The educational psychologist who ridiculed the study of Latin and boasted of his ignorance of claque is not a credit to the teaching profession, even if some of his insights on classroom behavior had merit.

If education is to do more than improve the self-image of students, the educational and cultural horizons of their teachers, and the teachers of their teachers, will have to improve. The radical, but obvious solution, and one that has been bruited about by more than one observer of the current state of education, is to require of future teachers a more general education, a full academic major, and a cap on the number of education courses in which they can enroll; the latter stipulation will in itself be an inducement to sample other fields and future teachers will share with traditional liberal arts students the joys of discovering the richness, depth, and relevance of world literature, they will develop the skill of writing a fluent, comprehensible English sentence, of maintaining a reasoned coherent argument for longer than five minutes. They will discover, ***inter alia***, the advantages of travelling to places other than Las Vegas or Bermuda.

The most successful teachers are those who have acquired a love of the subject they teach, a love acquired through familiarity. Even future high school teachers, who

are currently required to take 30 credits broadly distributed in their specialty, would doubtless benefit from an additional exposure to their subject as well as to related areas. Elementary teachers, from whose ranks sprung three of the teachers discussed earlier, including one of the two administrators, do not currently need an academic subject major. A teacher who only prepares a lesson from the textbook the night before it is needed—and then will use the same lesson until retirement—will not have the mastery needed to answer any but the simplest questions from students or be able to present a point creatively. Frequently a point has to be expressed as many as five times in different ways before it is fully comprehended by students. If a teacher derives his knowledge only from the text, the lesson can be taught in only one way; and insightful questions from students cannot be handled with profit to the students.

An Assessment

Teachers often complain they are not treated as professionals; law, medicine, accounting, and engineering are frequently adduced as comparisons. There is little benefit to analyzing this claim beyond reviewing the entrance and education requirements for these other professions. The claim to professionalism is based on, among other things, their having studied "professional" education courses. These do not, as has been demonstrated, possess the same rigor and depth as, say, courses in law and biology. The Graduate Record Examination scores mentioned earlier offer further insight into the merits of the teachers' claim. The nation-wide average score achieved by future graduate students of education on the verbal component was 440; the average for future lawyers was 508; for physicians, 515. The average nation-wide score on the mathematics portion for the graduate education students was 408; physicians scored 589, and civil engineers 649.[6]

The president of the New Jersey Education Association, in the course of defending them, recently described as uniform the contents and quality of the education courses offered by the state's public and private colleges. The

uniformity, she claimed, is supported by a congeries of statutes and administrative decrees of the Department of Higher Education. It would not be too audacious, based on this assurance and the experiences described earlier, to extrapolate a pattern of uniform dullness, intellectual stultification, and cultural shallowness.[7] Older, better educated members of the profession will candidly admit that the plethora of education courses they took in college did not measurably affect their professional behavior. Intelligent teachers of any age or experience level are no doubt grateful for the exposure to the jargon they would later hear at in-service training sessions at their schools.

Teachers enrolled in graduate level programs to qualify for positions in school administration offer the same observation: the courses are boring, abbreviated, and generally conducted in a dogmatic style, unrepresentative of the techniques the graduate students were told to use when conducting their own classes; some professors even persist in evaluating their students on the basis of how much they have come to know about students' private lives. The research projects assigned to graduate education students are rarely much more than busy work, providing neither insight for the student nor genuine contributions to the profession.

Until this year, moreover, the state colleges in New Jersey required a 2.0 (C minus) grade point average to enter the undergraduate education programs. This is hardly what is expected of pre-law or pre-medicine students. Even a generous 70 credit education program cannot compare, in depth or quality, with three years of full-time legal training or four years of medical school needed to enter those professions. A lawyer, however much he may be a master of statutes and procedures, will not advance very far if he cannot speak coherently and persuasively before others. Even these requirements have been waived for teachers in recent years.

The fierce reluctance of organized teachers to submit themselves to, and pass, a standardized test in either a

subject area or methodology speaks poorly for their comparisons with other professions; bar examinations and medical boards must be passed before one can become a lawyer or physician.

Teaching is undoubtedly a profession, but claims that it should be treated equally with the other professions, in terms of compensation and respect, cannot be sustained. Teachers should indeed enjoy public respect, however, because of their broad learning and reasoning ability. The degree of this respect will obviously be based on the amount of learning, and success in performing their mission, that is demonstrated. The professional responsibility of teachers is at once awesome and delicate, because of its formative impact on generations of discrete personalities. "Teachers," Gilbert Highet maintained in *The Art of Teaching*, "must see more, think more, and understand more than the average man and woman of the society in which they live."[8]

The Future

After this unnerving scrutiny of a current teacher preparation program, can one prophesy when a desperately needed alternative will be implemented? What would constitute a suitable program that would assure a supply of capable teachers in a society suffering from a long period of miseducation?

Most observers realize that higher salaries would contribute to a solution, but this is by no means a panacea. Opening the profession to intelligent, broadly educated liberal arts graduates, without compelling them to endure a series of frustrating education courses, would be an even more helpful remedy. A beguiling obsession with pedagogy has obscured the rightful place of subject matter.

Students might want voluntarily to enroll in a newly rigorous course in educational psychology, in order to have a purely theoretical background in how children learn. They might also want a course in the history of education, to be able to put past learning theories in perspective.

Regardless of peripheral options, subject area competence, a suitable personality, and a sense of mission should be the principal requirements.

To require a battery of education courses, even if reduced to a minimum of, say, four or five, would still have questionable value. Since the New Jersey education authorities will permit one to enter a classroom with only five education courses (New York requires only four), there must be tangible evidence that such people have not caused measurable harm to pupils in their charge. Similarly, there is no evidence that teachers with 43, 55, or 70 education credits behind them have measurably increased the quality of classroom teaching, or that there is a difference between a teacher with 70 education credits and one with only 43. If such relationships were provable, one might argue that every teacher should be required to enroll in 70, 90, or 120 credits.

Unless they are advocated by institutional and political authorities, successful reform of teacher education programs will not take place. New Jersey, the locus of this study, is moving, albeit glacially, toward reform. Even before public interest in the education crisis was provoked by the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the Carnegie Foundation, and others, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education had implemented a much delayed increase into the requirements for admission into undergraduate education programs, which usually takes place in the junior year. However modest the increase may seem to be, opposition to it was strong and it will be imposed in increments. Until September 1983, the minimum grade point average was 2.0 (C minus). It will rise to 2.25 in September 1984, and finally to 2.5 (a straight C) in September 1985. While the increase is obviously not calculated to induce a prompt return of public respect, it is an admission of past folly. (Entrance requirements to graduate level programs in education were not affected by these changes. A C-plus undergraduate average is still all that is necessary; and even this can be minimized, according to admissions counselors at one of the state colleges, if the

candidate can offer compensating attributes, like unusual hobbies, a lively personality, or an impressive GRE score).

Another important change in the teacher education programs is the imposition of a maximum number of education courses an education major may study. It was not uncommon for students, having determined the greater difficulty of liberal arts courses, to have enrolled in up to 90 credits of education courses. Now an education major must enroll in at least 90 credits in non-education courses, out of a minimum of 120 credits needed for graduation.[9]

Scant more improvement in admission standards can be expected until state legislators abandon their sworn devotion to the academic egalitarianism which requires that large numbers of poorly prepared, and probably uninterested, high school graduates, be allowed to attend state colleges. (A large number of parents expressing dissatisfaction with the poor quality of their teacher/employees in voting booths might generate interest among legislators.) An unwritten law of human behavior causes these students to seek out the least onerous program that will result in a degree. Until now, that program has been found in education departments.

Even these minimal improvements can be vitiated by still more grade inflation. Professors tend for their own survival to share the egalitarianism of their legislators and could easily re-evaluate their standards to make a straight C or C-plus the lowest grade obtainable in their courses. Even an English or biology professor benefits from grade inflation, since many of his students will be education majors satisfying the few mandated liberal arts requirements. "It has become very easy in this country to become a classroom teacher," observed Dr. Emily Feistritzer, author of the report on teacher status for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "It is also very hard to get fired."[10]

In a proposal that is at once refreshingly bold and decidedly innovative, the New Jersey Commissioner of Education, Saul Cooperman, strongly supported by Governor Thomas Kean, advocated in September 1983 a means of

attracting into the teaching profession intelligent, broadly educated people who already have college degrees in subject areas, but who do not want the burden and expense of enrolling in 43 credits of education courses.[11]

The plan, whose gestation predates the publication of the National Commission's report, is as simple in its design as it will be effective in its execution, and must be considered in relative terms a radical innovation. The Commissioner has proposed allowing a college graduate of any age to enter the profession by successfully passing a standardized test in a subject area and then spending a year as a teacher-intern in a participating school district. Since the student teaching component of traditional education programs is in practice more important to a future teacher than most course work, extending this component from eight weeks to a full year will increase that importance proportionately.[12]

The Kean plan would also increase the minimum statewide starting salary for a teacher with only a bachelor's degree and no experience to $18,500 from the 1983-84 average of $13,900. (The salaries in the less populated southern part of the state significantly affect the state-wide average. A more realistic average starting salary in the northern part of the state would be $15,400.) The difference between what local districts are currently paying and the proposed minimum would come from the state treasury.[13]

As for the education courses that a future teacher would miss by pursuing the Kean-Cooperman alternative, there is not much likelihood that either the teacher or his pupils would suffer. The one year internship, with its opportunity to work with an experienced master teacher in a real classroom, is worth more than the 90 credits of education courses not a few teachers have studied. Retaining pupil interest, maintaining discipline, and developing viable techniques of pupil evaluation are not arcane subjects that can be acquired only by passing through the mystery rites of a teacher preparation program.

As was to be expected, traditional teacher lobbies, the unions, college education faculties, textbook writers and publishers, organized a political campaign to prevent the

Cooperman-Kean plan from taking effect or to mitigate its effectiveness.[14]

To placate the organized opposition, Commissioner Cooperman appointed a panel of distinguished educators, including leaders of teacher associations, to evaluate the proposals. After six months of deliberations, the panel, headed by Ernest Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and currently president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, produced a report that substantially supported the Kean/Cooperman proposals. The opposition since has appeared to lose strength and seems resigned to accepting the implementation of some degree of significant reform.[15]

Indeed, public sentiment, nourished by the unavoidable political ramifications of the education issue, may, ultimately, force concessions from the education establishment. If New Jersey enacts a successful reform of its teacher licensing laws, other states may follow, and the results for the nation will be nothing less than salutary.

A member of a learned profession—and teaching has traditionally been accounted a learned profession—should exude learning, not ostentatiously, but capably. And not only in a specific subject area but also in what may be broadly defined as the liberal arts. "The teacher who knows only biology or French," Highet observed, "is not fit to teach at all."[16] Familiarity with the commonly accepted cultural core of their civilization must continue throughout life and not end with their own commencement exercise.

Simply because a teacher's expertise may be in chemistry should not preclude fluency in the use of the English language or classroom allusions to non-science disciplines. An English teacher should exhibit mastery of great literature and a more than nodding acquaintance with scientific phenomena. Both teachers should be expected to speak clearly, behave civilly, and avoid vulgarisms. Neither teacher should be reticent about using a polysyllabic vocabulary.

To serve as models for their students, teachers must help to perpetuate what is best in their civilization and what enhances the growth of young minds. To be paladins of

professionalism, they must again emulate the qualities Chaucer found in the clerk of Oxford, "gladly would he learn, and gladly would he teach."

Until teachers manifest a clear sense of their mission, the most elaborate and well-crafted attempts to improve contemporary education must ineluctably fail.

Notes

1. Robert Braun, "Future Teachers Low on College Boards," Newark *Star-Ledger*, August 14, 1983, p. 1.
2. Francis Griffith, "Teachers Are Part of the Problem," *University Bookman*, Fall, 1982, pp. 14-16.
3. Robert Braun, "Latest Study Confirms Teacher Status Declines," Newark *Star-Ledger*, August 28, 1983, p. 29.
4. Paul Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education* (New York: Horizon Press, 1964). passim; John Holt, *How Children Fail* (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1964), passim; Edgar Z. Friedenberg, *Coming of Age in America* (New York: Random House, 1965), passim; Charles A. Reich, *The Greening of America: How the Youth Revolution Is Trying to Make America Livable*, (New York: Random House, 1970), passim.
5. Benjamin S. Bloom, et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain* (New York: David McKay, 1964), passim; *Evaluation to Improve Learning: Human Characteristics and School Learning* (New York: Random House, 1976), passim.
6. Francis Griffith, "Teachers Are Part of the Problem," pp. 14-16.
7. Edithe Fulton, "To Strengthen Licensing," Newark *Star-Ledger*, November 27, 1983.
8. Gilbert Highet, *The Art of Teaching* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), p. 54.
9. Author's interview with Ceil Caruso, Office of Teacher Education, New Jersey Department of Higher Education, May 11, 1984.
10. "Low Teacher Pay and Status Faulted," *New York Times*, August 24, 1983, p. A12.
11. "Commissioner Explains His Licensing Plan," Newark *Star-Ledger*, November 13, 1983, p. 43.
12. "School Chief Takes Aim at Licensing to Attract Better-Qualified Teachers," Newark *Star-Ledger*, June 5, 1983, p. 1; New Jersey Education Association Research Department, New Jersey Teacher Salary Guides, 1983-84, p. 7.
13. Ibid.
14. Robert Braun, "Schools Chief Claims Foes Resort to Dirty Tricks," Newark *Star-Ledger*, April 29, 1984, p. 1.
15. Robert Braun, "Teacher Panel Boosts Kean Licensing Reforms," Newark *Star-Ledger*, March 4, 1984, p. 48.
16. Highet, *The Art of Teaching*, p. 217.